LBrok fill

/ /

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg re attached to Mr. Bresson 4/19/79

While I hope that the FBI will resolve the questions I raise in the attached I provide copies, as I informed Mr. Bresson, for any necessary appeal.

Yesterday, in preparing work on the files for my student helper, I was reminded that a large percentage of the OPR records provided in the King case were merely vast expanses of paper, entirely unbound and unassembled. As I went over them in haste I made what separations were possible. I find no worksheets. I believe records of the processing will enable the student to make individual files of the indidividual volumes and will permit the identification of the contents of each volume. At least I hope so. I would appreciate copies of the records of processing so that I may have this done.

Mr. Lesar has sent me a copy of your letter of March 26 of which he had assumed you had sent me a copy. With regard to your letter itself, I would prefer to let the matter rest as I asked in my recent reference to it, awaiting any possible developments.

You refer to but a single Department record relating to charges of perjury against John Ray, that of 11/30/78. However, before then he was thrown back in jail over the same alleged perjury, so there should be earlier, similar records. I believe that there must be other records relating to this and not provided.

Parenthetically, this coincided with my being reminded of the Clay Shaw case, where he was charged with perjury after the prosecution ended. The Supreme Court threw that out. I find it interesting that consideration supposedly is now being given to a similar prosecution of John Ray after he has served time that the parole board itself found to be greatly in excess of the norm, the sentence having been imposed by the present Director of the FBI.

With regard to the attachment of Mr. Tyler's 10/23/ 75 memo, which should have been provided by the FBI along with whatever it decided about administrative action, although the content was included in a public statement by the Department, also not provided, I am appreciative of your providing it for the completeness of the file.

The entire Hosty-Oswald matter is of exceptional historical importance, as I've indicated to you with partial explanations. I therefore would appreciate what I have not been provided and is referred to in the first sentence of Mr. Tyler's memo, "the Criminal Division's investigation in this case."

Even the nature of this investigation of the matter is quite significant. Was it limited, for example, th the records provided by the FBI? I have examined its records of its investigation with great care and interest/and have made a separate file of copies. Did it include the disciplining of Mr. Hosty? Of others? (Partially testified to before House committees.) The Criminal Division's was an investigation by lawyers. Prior to that

investigation the lawyers knew that the statute had run on any offense of a dozen years earlier. They also knew that it would never be possible to determine which versions of 1975 recollections could be proven to be false. (Did how so much is reminiscent of the John Kay case.) What there was for Criminal to really investigate also is significant.

I am particularly interested in whether this investigation included the FBIHQ knowledge of the matter in 1964, which was more than 11 years before its belated response to a news story and the Criminal Division investigation.

If the FBI ignored this matter in 1964 that also has significance.

Mr. Hosty is not the only SA who was disciplined. At least one other involved in pre-assassination Oswald investigations refused to accept punishment and resigned instead, which I regard as a strong protest of what that SA regarded as unfair. No records of this have been provided.

In fact, none of any disciplining have been.

In addition to what I hope you will agree is the historical importance of this entire matter and its contexts I have considerable personal interest in it and its possible ramifications. My recollection is that recently I have given you some explanations of this. Some years ago I laid aside the manuscript of a partly written book because I felt I required information then not available. I then filed several FOIA suits against others for what appeared to be relevant information they were withholding. In two other instances I was provided with withheld information just before I would have filed suit.

One of the records I obtained after litigation was of such importance as I evaluated importances and as the Congress has since then that when I could not pay the printer I nonetheless wrote a book around it and printed the entire record in facsimile.

History's and my own personal interests make us want every record relevant to the Hosty-Oswald matter, wherever it may be or however it may be filed.

If there is nothing to hide then there is no reason not to provide all records in an historical case.

If there is something to hide, that it not continue to be hidden is the purpose of the Congress in FOIA.